5/24/69

Dear Cindy,

You are great! You and your professor have been very helpful. I enclose a copy of the letter I am mailing at the same time I mail this one to Mr. Eugene. I think it will be self-explanatory. I regard his position and action as entirely improper and inconsistent with his diligent concern for the rights of his client, as I say.

Any comment on anyone's handwriting is inappropriate from one whose scrawl is as illegible as mine, yet I must report I am not certain I correctly read Mr. Eugene's address. If it is not correct on the letter, I'd appreciate it if you would phone him, tell him I have written him as addressed, and say that I asked him to alert the post office so the letter can be delivered to him. If he is reluctant or displays any reluctance, please also tell him I assure him it is important to him that he get this letter. As a last resort, I would ask you to make a photocopy of the carbon enclosed and send it to his correct address. If you do this, please let me know.

There are other things I would like you to do, but not if there is any chance they can create problems for you. Before doing them I want you to consult with your professor. First would be to ask the consulate or embassy for a set of the papers (do not tell anyone the Department of Justice has refused to respond, for that will scare them). Ask for the public-information officer, then ask if he(she) is the proper person to ask. If the answer is negative, ask who is. If you fail there, ask the clerk at the Bow St. Magistrate's Court. Please ask the professor if he can visualize any difficulty for you if you do this. If he thinks it possible, I do not want you to do it. Instead, let me know and I will seek to carry it further by mail. Please, if you do, keep note of what you do, to whom you speak, what they say, etc., and let me have copies of them.

This is all wrong. There appears to be no aspect that can be unsoiled. That Eugene would even think of speaking to the FBI is simply incredible, and it raises all sorts of questions about the character of Ray's defense. And that he should deny access to the public record is likewise entirely wrong, especially because the intended use cannot be against his client, is for it, and because all of it is known to, having originated with, the prosecution and the government.

I have no doubt Eugene has had several inquiries. Some may have been on my behalf, indirectly. That is, initiated because of requests for help I initiated here of those who could have the request made in other names in London.

Possibly it would be better if, after speaking to your prof., you again spoke to his lawyer. Ask him, please, and if he recommends it, then please do. I do not want you to get involved in anything that can kick back on you, and I have had enough experience in this work to know that the government has many connections, uses them, and in almost all cases, improperly. Those pledged to uphold the law are its most frequent and most consistent violators, unfortunately. I depend upon you to be mature and responsible about this, for I do not want any reaction against you, no matter how wrong it would be. The fact that it should not happen will do you no good.

To answer your question, incriminating evidence is suppressed simply because it is incriminating. This is worse than wrong, for the US concept of the prosecutor is primarily to see that justice is done, secondarily to get a conviction. It is culpable for the prosecution to withhold what is exculpatory. If the British papers have made no mention, the Ray hearing is Monday and he is suing his previous lawyers and Huie. Bad as he is, the hands into which he has fallen, if that is the right word, are even worse.

Cindy 5/34/69-2

Please thank you prof for the clipping from the Evening Standard of 5/14. I presume it is a review of Edward Reid's book, "The Grim Reapers", which I haven't seen. This paragraph is particularly interesting:" Marcello is alleged to have taken part in a secret meeting near New Orleans in September 1962, at which the assassination of President Kennedy was discussed."

If it is not a review, then whatever the unsigned author of the article knows about this would be interesting. There have always been rumors of Mafia plots against JFK, one because of an alleged failure to deliver what was promised for an alleged Mafia delivery of the Illinois vote (which elected JFK).

My own belief is that Marcello has too much going for him, is far too well off, to get involved in any such thing. I also think he has the help inside the Mafia to stop it.

The gambling activities referred to undoubtedly involve Mike McLaney, former tennis star and operator of the casino at El Nacional in Havana until Castro stopped it (see Oswald in New Orleans). His brother owned a small house near New Orleans in which anti-Castro munitions were stached. McLaney has just filed a very sizeable libel action against LIFE.

Do not go to any special trouble, but if you or the prof notice anything further about this in the British papers, I would like to see it. The FBI went through the motions of "investigating" Mafia connections with the assassination. Even for them it was inadequate. Ditto on the Ray case.

Marcello, by the way, has allegedly been the Number 2 man in the Mafia for some time. He could have gone up when the notch opened. His motel and restaurant near New Orleans (actually, indistinguishable from being in New Orleans except that it is just across the parish -that is, county, line in Jefferson Parish) is called the "Town and Country". There are other (unsubstantiated) rumors about it and money passing over the assassination there.

Reverting to the Ray case again, I'd prefer to have the government turn me down than to wait. If they refuse, I have enough from the papers and they will have made themselves look worse, for I will report it. I do not expect to find more in the papers than I have found in the press, but that is possible. However, what I have from the press is sufficient. I want to be certain there has been no misquotation. Of course, I also want to be as complete as possible, which is another reason for wanting the original and complete papers. But again I want to impress upon you that I want you to do nothing that can work against your personal interests, your schooling or your job.

Many thanks to you both. This has been helpful. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg